

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 29-36 are pending in this application. Claims 18-28 are hereby canceled without prejudice of disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 33-36 are new. Claims 29 and 33 are independent. Claims 29 and 30 are hereby amended. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification, specifically on pages 13-14 (paragraphs [0067]-[0072]). Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 21 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,488,389 to Nakanishi, et al (hereinafter, merely “Nakanishi”).

Claims 18-20 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,455,626 to Xu, et al (hereinafter, merely “Xu”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,835 to Watanabe (hereinafter, merely “Watanabe”).

Claims 22, 24, 25, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Nakanishi in view of Watanabe.

Claims 23 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Nakanishi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,231,497 to Mizuta (hereinafter, merely “Mizuta”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 29 recites, *inter alia*:

“...acquires a first reproduction output video signal by copying data of the odd field of each frame to the even field of the same frame, and
acquires a second reproduction output video signal by copying data of the even field of each frame to the odd field of the same frame...” (Emphasis Added)

As understood by Applicants, Nakanishi relates to a display device for displaying video signals by thinning depending on the number of horizontal display lines of display means, when displaying interlaced video signals by converting into non-interlaced video signals.

As understood by Applicants, Xu relates to apparatus, systems and methods for providing multiple video data streams from a single source.

As understood by Applicants, Watanabe relates to an image data recording/reproducing method for recording original-image data representing an original image and reduced-image data representing a reduced image of the original image on a recording medium such as a memory card or magneto-optical disk, and for reading and outputting the reduced-image data from the recording medium on which the data has been recorded.

As understood by Applicants, Mizuta relates to a method of image data interpolation used for converting a field signal into an interlaced signal in an image signal processing apparatus.

Applicants respectfully submit that Nakanishi fails to teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 29. Specifically, none of the references used as a basis for rejection describe a video decomposition section acquires a first reproduction output video signal by copying data of the odd field of each frame to the even field of the same frame, and acquires a second reproduction output video signal by copying data of the even field of each frame to the odd field of the same frame, as recited in claim 29.

Specifically, the Office Action relies on Nakanishi to describe a method of reading out video signal. However, Applicants submit that in the Nakanishi system, after reading out the M-1-th video signal from the field memory 4, since the N-th video signal has been omitted and not written in the field memory 3, the M-th video signal is read out successively from the field memory 4, as a result, the sequence of video signals is not changed (See, Nakanishi, col. 13, lines 46-54). In the present invention, as shown in FIG. 3(c), the interpolation section 111 performs interpolation by copying data of the odd-numbered field to generate an even-numbered field, thus generating the video signal P1', and as shown in FIG. 3(d), the interpolation section 112 performs interpolation by copying data of the even-numbered field to generate an odd-numbered field, thus generating the video signal P2' (See, Specification Fig. 3 and page 14, paragraphs [0071]-[0072]). Thus, nothing has been found in Nakanishi that would teach a video decomposition section acquires a first reproduction output video signal by copying data of the odd field of each frame to the even field of the same frame, and acquires a

second reproduction output video signal by copying data of the even field of each frame to the odd field of the same frame, as recited in claim 29.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Nakanishi fails to teach or suggest a video decomposition section acquires a first reproduction output video signal by copying data of the odd field of each frame to the even field of the same frame, and acquires a second reproduction output video signal by copying data of the even field of each frame to the odd field of the same frame, as recited in claim 29.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 29 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 29, independent claim 33 is patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 29 and 33 are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800